

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Introduction:

Claims 2-4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 16, 21, 39, 43, 45-49, 51, 53, 54, 56, 57, and 59 have been amended. Claims 5, 37, 38, 44, and 55 have been canceled, and claims 60-62 have been newly added. Claims 2-4, 6, 7, 9-25, 39, 43, 45-54, and 56-62 are now pending in the application. (Claims 1, 8, 26-36, and 40-42 were previously cancelled.) In addition, the specification has been amended. Applicant respectfully requests reexamination and reconsideration of the application.

Objections To The Specification:

The specification was objected to because of alleged informalities in the subheading on page 2 and numerous paragraphs. Applicant has amended the subheading on page 2 and paragraphs [0007], [0012], [0016], [0018], [0025], [0026], [0030], [0039], [0055], [0056], [0064], [0068], [0069], [0070], [0071], [0080], [0081], and [0082]. Applicant believes that these amendments address all of the Examiner's concerns regarding those paragraphs.

With regard to the formulas on page 17 and the alleged missing portions of paragraphs [0044], [0045], and [0046], Applicant believes that the formulas on page 17 are clearly defined and that no portion of paragraph [0044], [0045], or [0046] is missing. Thus, Applicant does not understand the Examiner's objection to page 17 or paragraphs [0044], [0045], or [0046]. Should the Examiner persist in these objections, Applicant requests that the Examiner explain why he believes the formulas on page 17 are not clearly defined and what he believes is missing from paragraphs [0044], [0045], and [0046]. Otherwise, Applicant will not know how to respond to those objections.

Objections To The Drawings:

Figures 3, 5, 9, 10, and 15 were objected to on various grounds. In the drawing changes filed on August 21, 2003, one of the two instances of reference label "40" was deleted from Figure 3, leaving only one instance of reference label "40" in Figure 3. Moreover, Applicant amended in the instant Amendment paragraph [0025], which should overcome the objection to Figure 5; paragraphs [0055] and [0056], which should overcome the objection to Figures 9 and

10; and paragraphs [0068], [0069], and [0070], which should overcome the objection to Figure 15. Applicant thus believes that all of the objections to the drawings have been overcome.

Rejection Of Claims As Indefinite:

Claims 51-53 were rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph as indefinite. Claims 52 and 53 appear not to be unclear themselves but appear to have been rejected solely because they depends from claim 51. Applicant has amended claim 51 to address the Examiner's concern. Applicant believes that the amendment to claim 51 overcomes the rejection of claims 51 and 52 for lack of clarity.

Objections To The Claims:

Claims 6, 37, 38, 39, 43, 47, and 54 have been object to on various grounds. Applicant amended or canceled claims each of these claims and believes that the objections to those claims have either been mooted or overcome.

Allowable Subject Matter And Rejection Of Claims Over Art:

Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the Examiner's indication that claims 3, 4, 7, 10, 11, 44-46, 55-57, and 59 contain allowable subject matter and would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 7, 10, 45, 46, and 59 have been rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim. Therefore, claims 7, 10, 45, 46, and 59 should be in condition for allowance.

Applicant also acknowledges with appreciation the Examiner's indication that claim 6 is allowable over the prior art because of coupling having at least 10dB of attenuation and a coupler that is smaller than the electronic component. Independent claim 48 has been amended to include a similar requirement and should therefore also be allowable. In addition, independent claim 2 has been amended to require coupling with an attenuation of at least about 10 dB. Thus, independent claim 2 should also be allowable.

All pending claims other than independent claims 2, 6, 7, 10, 45, 46, 48, and 59—all of which are allowable as discussed above—depend from one of claims 2, 6, 7, 10, 45, 46, 48, and 59 and should therefore also be allowable. Therefore, all pending claims should be allowable


over the prior art of record, including newly cited Patent No. 6,356,173 to Nagata et al. ("Nagata").

Conclusion:

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that all of the claims are allowable and the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a discussion with Applicant's attorney would be helpful, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (801) 323-5934.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 22, 2004

By 
N. Kenneth Burraston
Reg. No. 39,923

Kirton & McConkie
1800 Eagle Gate Tower
60 East South Temple
P.O. Box 45120
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111-1004
Telephone: (801) 323-5934
Fax: (801) 321-4893